



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that the existence of a ruler created, *ipso facto*, the duty of submission." The context makes it even more difficult to see what this means. For certainly there is a sense in which this would be true *par excellence* of the political attitude which became dominant *after* Luther and as a result of his influence. If, as has been the fate of the present reviewer, anyone comes to this book after a re-reading of such extraordinarily illuminating works as Mr. Figgis's writings on the history of political thought, its inadequacies become particularly obvious.

Nor is the book guiltless of positive error. For instance, in the chapters on Greek thought, where, it must be admitted, we see Mr. Brett at his worst, we read of the Greeks (p. 68) : "The beautiful was their ideal: not the true, nor the good, but the beautiful." Surely at this time of day no one ought to be capable of making a statement like this. But perhaps it was to be expected from a writer who refers only to Walter Pater for a general view of Plato's thought. On the other hand, in the succeeding chapters on the Cosmopolitan Age, and on the Roman Republic and Empire, Mr. Brett is perhaps at his best.

It is very unfortunate that a book so excellent in intention should be so inadequate in execution. But one must recognize that some of the faults are inevitable in a book which attempts to crowd a survey of the whole of history into three hundred pages. To attempt it on such a scale was to court failure, except perhaps for a writer of exceptional gifts.

G. C. FIELD.

University of Manchester, England.

PROPERTY: Its Duties and Rights Historically, Philosophically and Religiously Regarded. Essays by Various Writers. With an Introduction by the Bishop of Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co., 1913. Pp. xx, 198.

This collection of essays is better in achievement than in the aim of its proposer. The proposal and the actual working out are described by the Bishop of Oxford in the introduction: "Dr. Bartlet, of Mansfield College, Oxford, had written a letter to the *British Weekly* strongly urging upon Christians the duty of reconsidering their ideas about property in the light of the Bible doctrine of stewardship,—the doctrine that God the Creator is the only absolute owner of all things or persons.

. . . He was good enough to send me his letter and to suggest that we might combine to issue some literature of a popular kind about the duties and rights of property based on this Biblical doctrine. Naturally I felt a cordial sympathy with the idea, but I said that before anything of a popular kind was issued, I thought that we needed some more thorough or philosophical treatment of property in idea and history." The result is the present series by seven writers, partly lay and partly clerical. To the first two essays, by Prof. L. T. Hobhouse and Canon Rashdall, the description may be applied which the author expressly gives of the first: "The social functions of property are examined by the standard of purely humanitarian ethics."

Mr. A. D. Lindsay continues on the same line, though his treatment is slighter. Next (in the central position) follows a paper by Dr. Bartlet on "The Biblical and Early Christian Idea of Property"; and then come three historical essays by the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, Mr. H. G. Wood, and Canon Scott Holland; all referring especially to the development of ideas of property in Christendom. In this branch of the subject the most interesting point made seems to me to occur in Dr. Carlyle's paper; where it is noted (pp. 128, 129) that Aquinas reintroduced the Aristotelian conception of the State as a natural institution, property being regarded as an instrument of personality; but that "his adoption of the Aristotelian conception of nature and the State had little permanent influence, for the theory of the conventional nature of organized society," taken over by the Christian Fathers from the Stoics and, it might have been added as regards the idea of contract, from the Epicureans, "was too firmly rooted to be shaken, even by his authority," and "continued to dominate political theory till the end of the eighteenth century."

It may with truth be said that, apart from an influence such as that which it had on Dante, this humanist view did not return as an active power till the last century. The compliment may fairly be paid to the present volume that it is permeated by it. With differences of phraseology, the writers agree that the only possible ultimate defense of property is that it is necessary to liberty or personality. All agree further that an institution with so varied a history cannot be conceived to have now reached its final form. The paradoxes in its development are well brought out by Prof. Hobhouse: "The institution of prop-

erty has, in its modern form," defended as this has been especially from the point of view of the individual's rights, "reached its zenith as a means of giving to the few power over the life of the many, and its nadir as a means of securing to the many the basis of regular industry, purposeful occupation, freedom, and self-support" (p. 23). "The rise of large-scale industry" as a consequence of throwing open the career to the individual pursuit of wealth "has abolished the possibility of any form of individualism as a general solution of the economic problem" (p. 21). The balance may be said here to incline to a modified socialism. In Canon Rashdall's paper it inclines to a modified individualism. While "continuance of the whole system of private Capital as it is now understood" cannot be considered essential for the free unfolding of personality, he is himself "disposed to think that the institution of property cannot bring with it its full advantages, economic, moral, and social, without *some* form of capitalization and *some* rights of inheritance, however much these rights may be curtailed and controlled by the State" (p. 63). The particular solutions of the writers I do not attempt to give: in fact, they scarcely amount to definite schemes. With the general solution indicated I am quite in sympathy. Liberty in its sense of the positive development of personality I regard as the end; and this I take to exclude at once economic *laissez faire*, which has been proved by experience to lead to a grinding industrial tyranny, and the extreme forms of communism. Between these two limits, whether we call ourselves individualists or socialists seems to be a question of more or less. My own view is one which, like Canon Rashdall's, may, I think, be best described as individualist in its relation to property; the solution being State-regulation, as distinguished from State-ownership, of the capital by which industrial enterprise is carried on.

In agreement, as I am, with the general spirit of the volume, I wish to say as little as possible on the religious, as distinguished from the philosophical, point of view of some of the writers. I have paid a tribute at the beginning to the admirable modification effected by the Bishop of Oxford in the project as first outlined. The least intrinsically humanist, the most ecclesiastically minded of the writers seems to me to be Dr. Bartlet; and even he admits that the Christian Church, with the world at its feet, failed to transform the social and economic order.

The Church of the fourth century "simply shared the conventional ideas underlying the existing economic order, and the hand-to-mouth methods of dealing with its anomalies and evils" (p. 114). From Dr. Gore comes the still stronger admission that "the modern Church has generally been on the wrong side" (p. xix). Can it be wondered then if we do not find a solution by way of return to the Church and its ideals very hopeful? That individual churchmen can still aid in the development of humanist civilization there is no reason to deny.

T. WHITTAKER.

London, England.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES. Vol. I. Logic.

By Arnold Ruge, Wilhelm Windelband, Josiah Royce, Louis Couturat, Benedetto Croce, Federigo Enriques, Nicolaj Losskij. Translated by B. Ethel Meyer. London: Macmillan & Co., 1913. Pp. x, 269.

This book is the first of a series, later volumes of which are to deal with ethics, philosophy of religion, and other philosophical subjects. In an introduction Ruge sketches the scheme of the undertaking, and points out the differences between it and Hegel's *Encyclopædia*. The present undertaking is to contain contributions from numerous authors, not necessarily in agreement, and it is to take account of the advance of the special sciences since Hegel's time. This volume contains essays by Windelband, Royce, Couturat, Croce, Enriques, and Losskij; and the articles are, as far as I can see, well translated by B. E. Meyer.

I do not think that the scheme of the book is one that enables the contributors to offer their best. They are bound to be very condensed, and the result is that they cannot fully deal with the reasons for their views, or give the latest developments of them. Certainly they fulfil the promise of the introduction by lack of slavish agreement; thus, if Croce's opinions about symbolic logic be true, Couturat's article will not be worth the paper that it is written on, whilst Royce and Enriques will have spent a good part of their lives in futile pursuits.

Windelband contributes a long and careful article in which he deals with the relation of logic to psychology, —descriptive